

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 JACOB POOCHIGIAN,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00512-MMD-WGC

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 CONNIE STEINHEIMER, *et. al.*,

10 Defendants.

11
12 *Pro Se* Plaintiff Jacob Poochigian, an inmate in the custody of the Nevada
13 Department of Corrections (“NDOC”), brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before
14 the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge
15 William G. Cobb recommending that the Court dismiss this action for failure to file the
16 required financial certificate or pay the filing fee, and for failure to submit an amended
17 complaint. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff had until March 30, 2020, to file an objection. (*See id.*) To
18 date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the
19 Court adopts the R&R and dismisses this action in its entirety.

20 This Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
21 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
22 timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the Court is
23 required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and
24 recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails
25 to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue
26 that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also*
27 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the
28 magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both

1 parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed.
2 R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy
3 itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the
4 recommendation”).

5 Nevertheless, the Court conducts *de novo* review to determine whether to accept
6 the R&R. Judge Cobb notes that the Court directed Plaintiff to file the financial certificate
7 required for inmates seeking to proceed *in forma pauperis* or to pay the filing fee. (ECF
8 No. 7 at 1; ECF No. 6 at 2.) Judge Cobb also explains that because Plaintiff did not appear
9 to state any claims upon which relief could be granted, the Court gave Plaintiff 30 days to
10 submit an amended complaint. (ECF No. 7 at 1; ECF No. 6 at 2–3.) As of the date of this
11 order, Plaintiff has failed to take these actions. Therefore, Judge Cobb recommends that
12 this action be dismissed without prejudice. (ECF No. 7 at 2.) Upon reviewing the R&R and
13 the filings in this case, this Court finds good cause to adopt Judge Cobb’s recommendation
14 in full.

15 It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No.
16 7) is adopted in its entirety.

17 It is further ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice.

18 The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this order
19 and close this case.

20 DATED THIS 31st day of March 2020.

21
22
23


24 MIRANDA M. DU
25 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28